1 BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF EDWARD A. COON, PCHB No. 79-74 4 Appellant, FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, 5 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW v. AND ORDER 6 STATE OF WASHINGTON, 7 DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY, Respondent. 8 9

This matter, the appeal from the denial of an application for the appropriation of surface water, came before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Nat W. Washington, Chairman, Chris Smith and David Akana (presiding) at a formal hearing in Yakima on October 10, 1979.

Appellant was represented by his attorney, Patrick J. Morrissey; respondent was represented by Laura E. Eckert, Assistant Attorney General.

Having heard the testimony, having examined the exhibits, having considered the contentions of the parties and having considered the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

exceptions filed by the appellant and respondent, the Board makes thes.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Ι

In February of 1974, appellant Edward Coon submitted Surface Water Application No. S3-22567 to the respondent, Department of Ecology, for the use of 0.4 cubic foot per second (cfs) from Nicholson Creek, a small intermittent tributary to Toroda Creek (a perennial stream) in northern Okanogan County, Washington. Toroda Creek receives drainage from over a 200 square mile relatively arid area.

ΙI

Appellant owns property at the confluence of Nicholson and Toroda Creeks. He sought to appropriate water for rill irrigation of 20 acres during the period April 15 to August 30 of each year. His permit application was denied by the department because the proposed use of water would be detrimental to the public interest. The denial was appealed to this Board.

III

During consideration of appellant's application, the Department discovered that Nicholson Creek was tributary to Toroda Creek, which had been administratively closed to further appropriation of surface water at the request of the Washington State Department of Game since the early 1950's. Nicholson Creek supplies Toroda Creek through surface flow (intermittent) and ground water flow (continuous). The Department of Game considers, and evidence shows, that Toroda Creek is an excellent spawning and fishing stream for rainbow, cut-troat and Eastern brook trout.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

There are no minimum flows or base flows established by regulation for either Toroda or Nicholson Creek. The Department of Game suggested a minimum flow of 3 cfs "from the mouth of Toroda Creek upstream to the mouth of Nicholson Creek" in 1950. The Department of Game has since discredited this figure as too low because it was established as a stopgap measure and is not satisfactory, in its current judgment, to protect stream flows and the fish resource. During September 1979, which is a "dry" year, respondent estimated between 3.5 and 4 cfs at a point near the mouth of Nicholson Creek. The granting of the instant request would reduce the water available in the stream and result in a proportionate reduction of fish population in Toroda Creek already at levels presently considered only minimally acceptable by the Department of Game. Although the proposed appropriation will not by itself seriously harm the fisheries resource, the cumulative effect of other such appropriations would do so.

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

v

From these Findings, the Board comes to these CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

The only issue raised in this appeal concerns whether the instant application for appropriation of surface water is likely to prove detrimental to the public interest. RCW 90.03.290. If the appropriation would not be detrimental, then a permit should issue.

The evidence shows that further appropriation of any water from Nicholson Creek would result in lowering of the flow of water necessary to adequately support existing food and game fish population in Toroda Creek. It is not disputed that since the 1950's the Department of Game has consistently opposed additional appropriations in an effort to protect the remaining fisheries resource. Further_ appropriations would be contrary to the policies set forth in RCW Additionally, the appropriation of water from Nicholson 75.20.050. Creek would not further the purpose of preservation of the natural resources and the water resources of the State. RCW 90.54.010. As a general declaration of fundamentals, base flows necessary for the preservation of fish in perennial streams are protected and, where RCW 90.54.020(3). The instant application would possible, enhanced. not protect or enhance, but rather would be detrimental to the preservation of, the existing fish resource contrary to RCW 90.03.290. Moreover, as between the competing uses, i.e., irrigation and fish preservation, we cannot say that the proposed irrigation has been shown to maximize benefits to the people of the State, serve an overriding consideration of the public interest or provide the highest feasible development of the use of public waters. RCW 90.54.020(2 and 3); RCW 90.03.290.

In summary, we conclude that appellant has not shown that the proposed appropriation would not be detrimental to the public interest. Accordingly, the action of the Deprement of Ecology denying the application should be affirmed.

26

27

20

21

22

20

2‡

25

1	ļ II
2	Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is
3	hereby adopted as such.
4	From these Conclusions, the Board enters this
5	ORDER
6	The Department of Ecology Order denying Application No. S3-22567
7	is affirmed.
8	DATED thisday of February, 1980.
9	POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
10	Do a Da Do 1
11	MAT W. WASHINGTON, Chairpan
12	
13	CHRIS SMITH, Member
14	
15	DAVID AKANA, Member
16	Divid intitity inches
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
6	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
27	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER 5

1 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 2 I, LaRene Barlin, certify that I mailed, postage prepaid, copies of the foregoing document on the 3 day of February, 1980, to each of the following-named parties, 4 5 at the last known post office addresses, with the proper postage 6 affixed to the respective envelopes: 7 Mr. Patrick J. Morrissey Attorney at Law 8 Okanogan, Washington 98840 9 Ms. Laura E. Eckert Assistant Attorney General 10 Department of Ecology St. Martin's College 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 12 Mr. Lloyd Taylor Department of Ecology 13 St. Martin's College Olympia, Washington 98504 14 Mr. Edward A. Coon 15 Toroda Creek Wauconda, Washington 98859 16 17 18 19 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 20 212223 24 25 26 27